

REMARKS

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 10, 16, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh et al. (US 5,807,165).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Claim 9 has been amended. Support is provided by the specification (US 2004/0060814 A1) including in paragraphs [0015], [0019], [0021], [0024], and [0025].

Claim 9, as amended, of Applicant's claimed invention claims an apparatus (100) including: a platen (110); a polishing pad (120) located over the platen; a segmented cathode (130) located around edge of the polishing pad and between the platen and a rear surface of the polishing pad; a slurry (150) located on the polishing pad; a wafer (160) located on the polishing pad and the slurry; a wafer carrier (180) to hold the wafer; a segmented anode located between a rear surface of the wafer and the wafer carrier, the segmented anode being partitioned into small components that may be adjusted separately to change polishing rates for different materials; a power supply (190) to apply a voltage between the segmented cathode and the segmented anode; and a computer (200) to vary the voltage to improve uniformity of the polishing rates. See Figure 1.

In contrast, the Uzoh et al. reference cited by the Examiner teaches springs (65) to push electrodes (67) to hold edge of a wafer (W) in a wafer carrier (66), but fails to teach a cathode being located around edge of a polishing pad (64). See Figures 8-10. Also, see Col. 6, lines 4-5.

Uzoh et al. also fails to teach a segmented anode located between a rear surface of the wafer (W) and the wafer carrier (66).

Despite the assertion of the Examiner, Applicant wishes to respectfully point out to the Examiner that a segmented anode located between a rear surface of a wafer and a wafer carrier is clearly a non-obvious element of an embodiment of Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 9, as amended.

Applicant reiterates emphatically that this element of Applicant's claimed invention, as claimed in claim 9, as amended, is not merely a rearrangement as stated by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's opinion that location of the anode does not change (affect) operation of the apparatus.

Thus, Uzoh et al. does not render Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 9, as amended, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of making semiconductors at the time the invention was made.

Claims 10, 16, 17, and 19 are dependent on claim 9, as amended.

Thus, claims 10, 16, 17, and 19 are also not rendered by Uzoh et al. obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of making semiconductors at the time the invention was made.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to claims 9, 10, 16, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh et al. in view of Emesh et al. (US 6,572,74165).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Claim 18 is dependent on claim 9, as amended. See previous sections above.

Thus, claim 18 is also not rendered by a combination of Uzoh et al. and Emesh et al. obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of making semiconductors at the time the invention was made.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh et al. in view of Parikh et al. (US 2003/0040830).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Claims 20-25 are dependent on claim 9, as amended. See previous sections above.

Thus, claims 20-25 are also not rendered by a combination of Uzoh et al. and Parikh et al. obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of making semiconductors at the time the invention was made.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to claims 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh et al. in view of Walters et al. (US6,767,427).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Claims 26-28 are dependent on claim 9, as amended. See previous sections above.

Thus, claims 26-28 are also not rendered by a combination of Uzoh et al. and Walters et al. obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of making semiconductors at the time the invention was made.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to claims 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all claims pending, including claims 9, 10, and 16-28, are now in condition for allowance so such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 (a) (3), Applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

Should any additional charge or fee, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and § 1.17, be required, or otherwise needed, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 653-7897.

Respectfully submitted,
INTEL CORPORATION

Dated: January 18, 2008

 /George Chen/

George Chen
Reg. No. 50,807

INTEL CORPORATION
c/o INTELLEVATE, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Serial No.: 10/666,476

Attorney's Docket No.: 042390P11355C